RUBIKON

Tuesday, March 9, 2021, 5:00 p.m. ~ 13
minutes reading time

The sick-makers

The history of the opium trade shows that power groups sometimes benefit far more from illness than from health.

by Christian Kreiß
Photo: Tero Vesalainen / Shutterstock.com

Wearing a mask, hardly any movement in the fresh air, ban on indoor sports, little human touch and contact, flooding with constant

Fear vibrations ... But, that makes us sick! Some would like to exclaim indignantly at the moment and hope that if one would only explain this to the politicians, they would understand and the corona measures would be over. To think this way is naive, however. It has long been the case that a healthy person is officially the highest goal of the pharmaceutical industry, but it is also its worst nightmare. Because healthy people fall as a target group for them

Health industry practically. What does it all have to do with politics? Well, this question could also seem naive, because there are all sorts of common interests between Big Pharma and governments. Not for the first time in history, for reasons of power politics, attempts have been made to make large sections of the population sick, to eliminate the elites of a country and to make profits from "disruptions". In this context, the author recalls the British-Chinese opium war.

Question

Under the pretext of advocating free trade, the

Nineteenth century millions of people consciously and with sight were sent to health ruin and a miserable death. As a result, the masterminds killed two birds with one stone. For one thing, there were huge corporate profits. On the other hand, the economic and social basis of the victim country was permanently ruined and, in particular, its elite made weak and willless over generations. This made the country easily governable and comparatively easy to exploit as a colony.

What can we learn from this?

> **Consciously ruining health can be a very successful concept. On the one hand, you can shovel huge profits with it and become incredibly rich.**

Second, it can increase one's political power. Thirdly, we can learn from this that one should put forward other, more noble reasons for one's plan and distract them from the actual intentions as much as possible. And fourth: Above all, you have to eliminate the leading opposing heads, from whom the main resistance could come. This proven successful concept can also be applied well today.

The opium war between Great Britain and China 1840 to 1842

In the first half of the 19th century, opium became Britain's main export to China. In the British colony of India, poppy seeds were grown and processed into opium. Then it was sold to China by British merchants at "fabulous profits". Although opium consumption was officially banned in China, smuggling networks ensured a dramatic increase in sales. "In combination with tobacco, the 'schnapps-like vapors' became the much-cited 'panacea for all human suffering'", writes journalist Berthold Seewald in his article "This is how England rose to become the world's largest drug dealer" in 2018 *World (* 1). From 1800 to 1834, the import of opium into China increased tenfold to around two and a half million kilos of pure drug (2). By 1800, China had around 300 to 400 million inhabitants, which was around a third of the world's population (3).

Since opium is a highly addictive, health-damaging drug, the Chinese emperor decided in 1839 to enforce the opium ban. Among other things, over 20,000 boxes of opium, which corresponded to about half of the imports for a whole year, were confiscated by the Chinese side and publicly burned (4). With

In order to protect free trade and restore the honor of England, Britain began a war against China in the fall of 1840. In the meantime, in the knowledge of the high military superiority, arguments have been put forward

China refused peace negotiations by England until final victory was achieved. Due to the towering superior military technology, Great Britain won the war without significant losses (5).

Effects

Through the “Unequal Treaties” of 1842, the opium trade was de facto legalized for generations (6). China had to pay enormous reparations payments and Hong Kong became a British crown colony. As a result, Chinese opium imports increased by a further 25 percent by 1850. By 1900 about 10 percent of the Chinese population were opium smokers, and three to five percent of the Chinese were excessive. Tens of millions of people have been slowly emaciated and driven to their deaths (7). "The First Opium War ushered in the decline of China from the once unrestricted hegemonic power of Asia to an informal colony," we read at *Wikipedia (* 8th). After this war, China sank into lethargy, corruption, inflation, hunger, insecurity and hardship. Many army units were also no longer able to perform their duties due to the consumption of opium (9). The country was checkmated for generations.

How was the argument for the war?

Interestingly, the treaty of 1842 did not mention the smuggling of opium at all; the opium trade was officially legalized for domestic political reasons

The British government avoided it and the British top politicians did everything in the aftermath to avoid being associated with the term "opium". The word “opium” appears only once in the entire treaty, namely when it came to the reparation payments for the opium burning by the Chinese (10).

This brings us to the question: why did the British Parliament vote in favor of a war whose main purpose, as practically everyone knew, was to spread a nasty drug? Because the leading circles in England and the parliamentarians were well aware of the addictive, harmful effects of opium (11). The military situation was clear. Due to the high technical superiority it was clear that Great Britain would win the war (12). But how should one justify such a morally questionable company politically and publicly? After all, the renowned American historian and sinologist John K. Fairbank described the forced British opium deliveries to China 150 years later as "the longest-lasting and systematic international crime of modern times" (13).

Ultimately, public opinion and parliamentary discussions were skilfully distracted from the human, moral or health-ruining question. It was emphasized that the Chinese destroyed British property - more than

Burning 20,000 boxes of opium publicly - insulting the British Crown for calling the British “barbarians” and that trade with China without “measures of strength and energy (...) can no longer be done with security for life and property” (14) could take place. It has been argued that China would also benefit from opening its markets and integrating it into the world economy (15).

British Foreign Secretary Palmerston, at whose instigation the

War had been waged, wrote shortly after the end of the war that the war had brought "satisfactory results", "undoubtedly this event will represent an epoch in the advancement of the civilization of the human races" (16). In short: they used good-sounding arguments as a pretext and skilfully ignored the inhuman, health-damaging effects.

How was the war engineered?

But how was that achieved? There was a decisive mastermind, today one would say a lobbyist, who had an enormous interest in a war against China: William Jardine, an opium dealer who became immensely rich through these deals and finally even got a seat in the British Parliament (17). Jardine, together with his business partner Matheson, threaded the argument brilliantly and systematically. As a rich, influential trader, he initially succeeded in winning the foreign minister's ear to his ideas. Then he systematically turned to the public. The two opium dealers planned in detail to secure the approval of the leading newspapers and to win "Literary Men", writers, who were to advance the war.

Both succeeded with flying colors. Many newspapers reported on behalf of the war party within a short period of time. A bestselling author was commissioned to write a book that appeared punctually in early 1840, a few months before the start of the war. In the book, those responsible in China were insulted and, after retaliation, called to save the national honor (18). So it was anything but coincidence that public opinion in Great Britain and the British Parliament turned. The parliamentary vote was ultimately extremely tight with 271 to 262 votes. Very rich,

Merchants who were not too moral were probably the decisive factor in the end (19).

backgrounds

What is missing from practically all historical accounts, however, is the following: Opium is essentially a drug for wealthy people, because it is not really cheap, especially when you take into account that increased consumption of opium will permanently incapacitate you. Opium is a drug for the elite. Contemporary statistics also confirm this (20). As a result, the leading circles of a people can be made weak, sick and apathetic or without will for generations.

> **From a power-political point of view, it is a brilliant move to eliminate the elites of another people. This renders a country defenseless, docile and suppressible in the long term.**

The strategy of extermination of the elites has long been known in warfare and has been used very successfully for thousands of years to this day. Even if this argument is never mentioned in the official historical literature on the Opium Wars with which I am aware, in my opinion it should have been very well known to the real masterminds - by which I do not mean the merchants Jardine and Matheson - and should be the most important or the real reason have been for the war. In fact, the flooding of China's elite with opium made the country a helotic people for about four generations, up to Mao.

Lessons from history

What can we learn from history? With regard to how we deal with Corona, we could draw the following lessons:

1. Gains and power growth through making sick

Today, as then, there are winners when larger parts of the population are made sick.

> **The sicker and drug addict people are, the better for those who maximize profits**
>
> **Pharmaceutical companies today. Healthy people, on the other hand, are a nightmare for the pharmaceutical industry, because then there are almost no sales and profits.**

Political measures that are detrimental to health, such as as little exercise outdoors as possible, as little sport as possible, wearing a lot of masks, in the CO2-rich air and

Harmful chemical substances are inhaled, little social contacts, a lot of screen and media use, a lot of fear and so on: All of this weakens our health and resistance, especially that of our children, and thus ensures increasing profits for the pharmaceutical industry in the long term. For the pharmaceutical industry, corona lockdowns are good business in the long term.

As the US opioid affair in the United States (21), which has led to a sharp rise in the number of deaths to this day, shows that profits are often more important to pharmaceutical companies than human life or health (22), just as it was to the opium dealers back then. A sub-area of the pharmaceutical industry, the vaccination industry, in turn, has a particularly strong interest in creating fear of illness and death from the coronavirus through the most one-sided, distorted press reports possible in order to boost sales.

From a power point of view, one can assume that today, as then, people are frightened, weakened and sick

are easier to govern. A great advantage for power-hungry politicians.

2. Profits from economic and social crises

As then, there are big winners today when a country's economy collapses. Large corporations with comfortable cushions of liquidity, short speculators and certain hedge funds increase their profits and their market share when medium-sized and small businesses go bankrupt. A great way to do this is to lockdowns that are as long and as hard as possible (23). The more the media and politicians stir up fear of the virus, the more certain they are.

3. One-sided, distorted press reports

Then as now there is a distorted media presentation, but today to a much greater extent than then, one has learned something new. As stated above, very influential players today have the greatest interest in untruthful, unbalanced, but one-sided, distorted reporting in the media. Like the opium dealers back then, powerful interest groups are doing everything they can to establish and consolidate a one-sided perspective in public opinion - with success. In the mainstream media today, interest-based, distorted and often misleading arguments are systematically pushed to the fore, counter-arguments are ignored.

4. Elite elimination

In order not to let the opposing opinion come into play, the strategy of eliminating the elite is used today as it was then. Leading journalists who contradict the common majority opinion are tried by discrediting or defaming, deleting *Youtube* Videos and other social

Silencing media channels, sales bans for corona-critical books on Amazon, account lockouts, threats of official measures and so on. Renowned scholars with a contrary opinion are discredited in the media, such as Prof. Sucharit Bhakdi, and largely ignored in public discourse, such as the excellent scientific representatives of the Great Barrington Declaration (24). In short: the opposing opinion elite should be actively and deliberately eliminated. On the other hand, scientists like Neil Ferguson or Christian Drosten, who have already attracted attention in the past with massive false prognoses in favor of the vaccination and pharmaceutical lobby, are hyped on all channels and by politicians (25).

5. Push best-selling authors

Even the concept of finding a bestselling author and disseminating a one-sided interest-driven opinion in a publicly effective manner, as the two wealthy opium dealers planned and implemented with great success in 1839, is still used today: Klaus Schwab and his books are written by the extremely influential and wealthy protagonists who stand behind him are pushed to the greatest possible extent and thus ensure that a very specific view is purposefully put into the world and public opinion is massively influenced.

Summary

> **Today, just as in the 19th century, there are certain interest groups who profit enormously from disease-causing strategies financially and in terms of power politics and who do everything in their power to influence public opinion in a one-sided and misleading way.**

Today, as then, politicians are often willing helpers. I think we can learn a lot from history, especially about the dire long-term consequences of this

inhuman politics can be.

Sources and Notes:

(1) Seewald, Berthold: First Opium War. England became the world's largest drug dealer, *welt.de,* January 20, 2018: **https://www.welt.de/geschichte/article172647940/ErsterOpiumkrieg-Als-England-weltgroesster-Drogend**

became.html (https://www.welt.de/geschichte/article172647940/ErsterOpiumkrieg-Als-England-weltgroesster-Drogendealer-

. (2) Ibid.

(3) First Opium War, **https://de.wikipedia.org/wiki/Erster_Opiumkrieg** (https://de.wikipedia.org/wiki/Erster_Opiumkrieg) , accessed March 1, 2021.

(4) Ibid.

(5) “By the end of the war, the British side had lost 530 men, 69 of whom were killed in action. No precise figures are available about the Chinese losses. Estimates amount to 18,000 to 20,000 dead and wounded. ”, Ibid.

(6) Compare Rowntree, Joshua, The Opium Habit in the East. A study ofthe Evidence given to the Royal Commission on Opium
1893, Westminster 1895: **https://core.ac.uk/download/pdf/77119797.pdf** (https://core.ac.uk/download/pdf/77119797.pdf) , Page 85: "Kwo Sung-tao was disappointed on finding that Professor Legge held that the English took higher views of virtue than the Chinese, and retorted," You say that England, looked at from a moral standpoint,

is better than China; Why then, let me ask you, has England tried to force upon China her opium, and still continues to do so? "(7) *welt.de,* 20th January 2018.

(8th) **https://de.wikipedia.org/wiki/Erster_Opiumkrieg** (https://de.wikipedia.org/wiki/Erster_Opiumkrieg) , accessed March 1, 2021.

(9) *welt.de,* 20th January 2018.

(10) “The contract itself did not address the problem of opium smuggling. The word “opium” only appeared once when determining the reparation payments. For domestic political reasons, both British governments shied away from calling for the opium trade to be legalized. The opium dealers themselves did not make this demand either, since the established canton dealers had to expect less competition from a continuation of the smuggling ”.

https://de.wikipedia.org/wiki/Erster_Opiumkrieg (https://de.wikipedia.org/wiki/Erster_Opiumkrieg) , accessed March 1, 2021.

(11) University Press: October 29, 2015: **https://www.cambridge.org/core/journals/historical-journal / article / abs / notions-of-addiction-in-the-time-of-thefirst-opium-war / A6D45CFB75A811B464E14CC525FB76AB** (https://www.cambridge.org/core/journals/historical-journal / article / abs / notions-of-addiction-in-the-time-of-thefirst-opium-war / A6D45CFB75A811B464E14CC525FB76AB)

(12) "It was an unequal war in which the Chinese fought with wooden sampans against armored gunboats, with lances and swords against modern artillery, with peasant militias against professional soldiers" quoted *welt.de,* January 20, 2018, the historian Kai Vogelsang.

(13) Quoted by Cassan, Benjamin, William Jardine: Architect of the First OpiumWar, Benjamin Cassan, Historia, Department of History at Eastern Illinois University Volume 14 2005, p106-117: **https://www.eiu.edu/historia/Cassan.pdf:** (https://www.eiu.edu/historia/Cassan.pdf :) "The most long-

continued and systematic international crime of modern times. " (14) Cassan at the specified location.

(15) **https://de.wikipedia.org/wiki/Erster_Opiumkrieg** (https://de.wikipedia.org/wiki/Erster_Opiumkrieg) , called on March 1, 2021: "It was also argued that the forced contracts would bring economic improvement to the Chinese people."

(16) Cassan at the specified location.

(17) **https://de.wikipedia.org/wiki/Erster_Opiumkrieg** (https://de.wikipedia.org/wiki/Erster_Opiumkrieg) , accessed March 1, 2021: "During the war, influential opium dealers such as William Jardine and James Matheson rose to prominence and took seats in parliament" (18) Cassan at the specified location.

(19) Ibid.

(20) Compare Rowntree at the specified location, page 91 following.

(21) **https://de.wikipedia.org/wiki/Opioidkrise_in_den_USA** (https://de.wikipedia.org/wiki/Opioidkrise_in_den_USA) , accessed March 1, 2021.

(22) Compare Kreiß, Christian: Purchased Research - Science in the Service of Corporations, Berlin and Munich 2015, Europa Verlag.

(23) Kreiß, Christian, From lockdown to sell-out of the middle class, *Telepolis,* January 7th, **https://www.heise.de/tp/features/Vom-Lockdown-zum-Ausverkauf-des-Mittelstandes-5002052.html** (https://www.heise.de/tp/features/Vom-Lockdown-zum-Ausverkauf-des-Mittelstandes-5002052.html) .

(24) Great Barrington Declaration, **https://gbdeclaration.org/** (https://gbdeclaration.org/) As of March 2021, more than 13,700 medical and public health scientists have signed the declaration

(25) Kreiß, Christian, Corona and Purchased Science - How false science plunges the world into an abyss,

NachDenkSeiten, October 28, 2020,

https://www.nachdenkseiten.de/?p=66244

(https://www.nachdenkseiten.de/?p=66244) .

Welt.de January 20, 2018: “Ten percent of the Chinese population

consumed opium. The photo shows smokers around 1900, source: picture-alliance / United Archive ". Published by welt.de (https://www.welt.de/geschichte/article172647940 / First-Opium-War-As-England-world-largest-drug-dealer-became.html) .

Christian Kreiß, Born in 1962, studied Economics and received his doctorate in Munich on the Great Depression from 1929 to 1932. After seven years as an investment banker in various commercial banks, he has been teaching since 2002 as a professor of finance and economic policy at Aalen University. He is the author of several books. More information at

www.menschenrechteewirtschaft.de (http://menschenrechteewirtschaft.de/) .

This work is under one **Creative Commons License (Attribution Noncommercial - No Derivatives 4.0 International** (https://creativecommons.org/licenses/by-nc-nd/4.0/deed.de)) licensed. You may distribute and reproduce it in compliance with the license conditions.